



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,785	09/22/2000	James Longbottom	WEAT/0042	2355

36735 7590 05/06/2005

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD, SUITE 1500  
HOUSTON, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER
----------

FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/668,785

Applicant(s)

LONGBOTTOM ET AL.

Examiner

Vanel Frenel

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57-68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Notice to Applicant**

1. This communication is in response to the Restriction filed on 01/21/05. Claims 1, 4-6, 16, and 18 have been elected from Group 1, Species A with traverse. Claims 1-56 are pending.

### **Election/Restrictions**

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group 1, Species A in the reply filed on 1/21/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Not all the claims are included. This is not found persuasive because after further consideration election requirement has been withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 1-56 will be examined.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman (5,504,491), Tubel et al (5,730,219) and in view of Yamazaki et al (6,867,752).

(A) As per claim 1, Chapman discloses a method of communicating between at least one on-site location and at least one off-site location (Col.4, lines 33-67), the method

Art Unit: 3626

comprising: providing a portable communications attachment to be positioned at the on-site location (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); establishing a 2 or more-way communication system between the at least one on-site location and the at least one off-site location See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); and remotely monitoring activities at the on-site location via the portable communications attachment and the 2 or more way communication system (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67),

Chapman and Tubel do not explicitly disclose displaying one or more instructions from the at least one off-site location to the on-site personnel, wherein the one or more instructions are displayed by the portable communication attachment.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Yamazaki. In particular, Yamazaki teaches displaying one or more instructions from the at least one off-site location to the on-site personnel, wherein the one or more instructions are displayed by the portable communication attachment (See Yamazaki, Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Joao within the combined teachings of Tubel and Chapman with the motivation of providing an image displayed on a displayed portion of a portable information terminal is displayed on an HMD (head mount display) worn by a user on his/her head. Information is sent and received between the portable information terminal and the HMD using wireless information transmitting/receiving

means such as infrared-ray data communication or data communication by radio wave  
(See Yamazaki, Col.2, lines 5-11).

(B) As per claim 2, Tubel discloses the method further comprising remotely directing activities at the on-site location (Col.5, lines 63-67 to Col.6, line 42).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(C) As per claim 3, Tubel discloses the method further comprising determining positional information of at least one person or object from the on-site location and monitoring the positional information from the off site location (Col.8, lines 4-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(D) As per claim 4, Tubel discloses the method wherein the activities include the sensing of conditions within a wellbore (Col.9, lines 45-67 to Col.10, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(E) As per claim 5, Tubel discloses the method wherein the activities include activities recordable and usable to form a basis for billing (Col.19, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(F) As per claim 6, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the activities include technical activities from the list of equipment operation, diagnostics, or identification (Col.19, lines 1-67; Col.21, lines 41-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(G) As per claim 7, Tubel discloses the method, wherein monitoring relates to fishing activities (The Examiner interprets water 16 to the surface of the ocean floor 18 and then downwardly into formations under the ocean floor as a form of fishing activities Col.8, lines 64-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(H) As per claim 8, Tubel discloses the method, wherein fishing activities relate to data transmitted to the off-site location from at least one sensor located in a wellbore (Col.8, lines 3-55).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(I) As per claim 9, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the sensor in the wellbore gathers information related to the condition of a string of tubulars in the wellbore (Col.18, lines 20-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(J) As per claim 10, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the method further comprises providing an on-site computer, wherein the 2 or more-way communication system comprises the on-site computer (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(K) As per claim 11, Chapman discloses the method, wherein the positional information is determined by GPS equipment (Col. 4, lines 38-48).

(L) As per claim 12, Chapman discloses the method, wherein the GPS signal is compared to a database to automatically identify the source of the data transmission (Col.4, lines 49-67 to Col.5, line 43).

(M) As per claim 13, Tubel discloses the method, wherein said portable communications attachment automatically utilizes the communication system to transmit

data including status, usage, and location to a rental center according to a predetermined schedule (Col.20, lines 13-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(N) As per claim 14, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the portable communications attachment is configured to be worn by, or attached to, a person at the on-site location (Col.9, lines 58-67 to Col.10, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman and Tubel are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(O) As per claim 15, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the portable communications attachment is configured to be detachably attached to a hardhat that is worn by an on-site person (Col.23, lines 46-67 to Col.24, lines 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(P) As per claim 16, Yamazaki discloses the method wherein activities include the measurement of pieces of tubulars to determine their length utilizing the communications attachment (Col.3, lines 65-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.



(Q) As per claim 17, Tubel discloses the method wherein activities further include the automatic recordal of the length of pieces of tubular prior to insertion of the pieces of tubular into a wellbore (Col.18, lines 20-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(R) As per claim 18, Yamazaki discloses the method wherein activities relate to the measurement of torque developed between adjacent pieces of tubular being assembled together utilizing the communications attachment (See Yamazaki, Col.3, lines 65-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(S) As per claim 19, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the 2 or more-way communication system utilizes a networked communication system (Col.9, lines 45-67 to Col.10, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(T) As per claim 20, Yamazaki discloses the method, wherein the portable communications attachment is provided on a hardhat and wherein a log-on data

facilitates an automatic recordal for billing of the time that the hardhat is used (Col.2, lines 4-7).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(U) As per claim 21, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the on-site person can manually position the communications attachment (Col.16, lines 5-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(V) As per claim 22, Tubel discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a portion of said or more-way communication system comprises the Internet (Col.15, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(W) As per claim 23, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the 2 or more-way communication system further comprises a hard hat and a global positioning component physically connected to the hard hat (Col.24, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(X) As per claim 24, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the 2 or more-way communication system further comprises a hard hat having a "flip down" screen for visual display of data (Col.15, lines 14-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(Y) As per claim 25, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the 2 or more-way communication system further comprises a hard hat and an on-site computer and wherein data transmitted between the hard-hat and the on-site computer is Internet accessible (Col.14, lines 34-67 to Col.15, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(Z) As per claim 26, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the on-site computer can be interrogated by off-site personnel authorized to review data related to current and past operations (Col.16, lines 59-67 to Col.17, line 67).

(AA) As per claim 27, Tubel discloses an apparatus comprising: an off-site service computer; a portable communications attachment positionable on an on-site personnel at a worksite Col.17, lines 45-67 to Col.18, line 67); and a communication system between the communications attachment and the off-site service computer (Col.17, lines 45-67 to Col.18, line 67).

Chapman and Tubel do not explicitly disclose the portable communications attachment comprising a transceiver and a display for displaying instructions received from the off-site service from the off-site service computer.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Yamazaki. In particular, Yamazaki teaches the portable communications attachment comprising a transceiver and a display for displaying instructions received from the off-site service from the off-site service computer (Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Joao within the combined teachings of Tubel and Chapman with the motivation of providing an image displayed on a displayed portion of a portable information terminal is displayed on an HMD (head mount display) worn by a user on his/her head. Information is sent and received between the portable information terminal and the HMD using wireless information transmitting/receiving means such as infrared-ray data communication or data communication by radio wave (See Yamazaki, Col.2, lines 4-11).

(BB) As per claim 28, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communications attachment further comprises a parameter measuring device (Col.18, lines 8-67; Col.21, lines 1-67 to Col.22, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(CC) As per claim 29, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system further comprises an on site computer that generates data or information to the off-site service computer (Col.17, lines 45-67 to Col.18, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(DD) As per claim 30, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communications attachment is secured to a piece of clothing, or a hardhat (Col.24, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(EE) As per claim 31, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system is capable of video transmission, audio transmission, still image transmission, and data transmission (Col.15, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman and Tubel are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(FF) As per claim 32, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises a video portion (Col.15, lines 14-43).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(GG) As per claim 33, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises an audio portion (Col.15, lines 14-43).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamzaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(HH) As per claim 34, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises a still image portion (Col.15, lines 14-43).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(II) As per claim 35, Tubel discloses the apparatus wherein the communication system comprises a display (Col.2, lines 54-67 to Col.3, line 10).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman and Tubel are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(JJ) As per claim 36, Tubel discloses the apparatus, further comprising a database for storing information, wherein the information may be collected real time at point of service delivery and stored in the database (Col.14, lines 22-67 to Col.15, line 67; Col.17, lines 45-67 to Col.18, line 19).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(KK) As per claim 37, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises the Internet (Col.14, lines 34-67 to Col.15, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(LL) As per claim 38, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises a local link connecting the communications attachment to the remainder of the communication system (Col.13, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(MM) As per claim 39, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises a satellite based portion (Col.13, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(NN) As per claim 40, Tubel discloses the apparatus, wherein the communication system comprises a land-based portion (Col.9, lines 1-57).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(OO) As per claim 41, Tubel discloses the apparatus, further comprising a data acquisition and control unit to input information sensed from a process (Col.14, lines 32-67 The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman and Tubel are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein. to Col.15, line 43).

(PP) Claim 42 differs from claims 1 and 27 by reciting a method of accessing and utilizing off-site service personnel from an on-site location, comprising:

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses securing a communications attachment having a display portion to an on-site personnel (Col.4, lines 49-67 to Col.5, line 67); establishing communications between the on-site personnel and off-site service personnel (Col.4, lines 49-67 to Col.5, line 67) communicating procedures from the off-site service personnel to the on-site personnel (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and communicating information in response to the one or more procedures from the on-site personnel to the off-site service personnel (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein at least one of the one or more procedures is displayed by the communications attachment (See Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a method of accessing and utilizing off-site service personnel from an on-site location to perform their specified function.



The remainder of claim 42 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1 and 27, and incorporated herein.

(QQ) As per claim 43, Tubel discloses the method, further comprising tracking on line time that the on-site personnel spends communicating with the off-site service personnel (Col.16, lines 5-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 42, and incorporated herein.

(RR) As per claim 44, Tubel discloses the method further comprising storing the communicated information in a database (Col.14, lines 46-67 to Col.15, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 42, and incorporated herein.

(SS) Claim 45 differs from claims 1 and 42 by reciting a method of doing business comprising:

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses providing a portable communications attachment that can be positioned on an on-site person at an on-site location (Col.3, lines 54-65); establishing a 2 or more-way communication system between the on-site location and a service person located at an off-site location (Col.3, lines 54-65); remotely directing activity at the on-site location by the service person, wherein the service person communicates one or more procedures to the on-site

person (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); and returning information obtained as a result of performing the one or more procedures (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein at least one of the one or more procedures are displayed by the portable communications attachment (See Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a method of doing business to perform their specified function.

The remainder of claim 42 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1 and 42, and incorporated herein.

(TT) As per claim 46, Tubel discloses the method of doing business further comprising storing said returned information in a database (Col.14, lines 46-67 to Col.15, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 45, and incorporated herein.

(UU) Claim 47 differs from claims 1, 27, 42 and 45 by reciting a system for monitoring conditions at a well site.

As per this limitation, it is noted that Tubel discloses a communications attachment positionable on an on-site person at the wellsite location (See Tubel, Col.13, lines 1-67 to Col.14, line 67); and a 2 or more-way communication system coupled to the communications attachment, the 2 or more-way communication system established

between the wellsite location and the off-site location (Col.13, lines 1-67 to Col.14, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein the communications attachment includes a transceiver and a display device for displaying instructions received from an off-site location (See Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a system for monitoring conditions at a well site to perform their specified function.

The remainder of claim 42 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1, 27 and 42, and incorporated herein.

(VV) Claim 48 differs from claims 1, 27, 42, 45 and 47 by reciting a system for providing on-site services from a remote location, comprising:

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses a communications attachment securable to an on-site person (See Col.4, lines 49-67 to Col.4, line 67); a 2 or more-way communication system coupled to the communications attachment, the 2 or more-way communication system establishing communications relating to on-site equipment (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); wherein the 2 or more-way communication system is configured to communicate instructions from the remote location to the communications attachment and to return information to the remote location pertaining to the on-site equipment (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein the communications attachment includes a transceiver and

a display device for displaying instructions received from an off-site location (See Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a system for providing on-site services from a remote location to perform their specified function.

The remainder of claim 48 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1, 27, 42, 45 and 47, and incorporated herein.

(WW) As per claim 49, Tubel discloses the system further comprising a database in said 2 or more-way communication system storing said returned information (Col.14, lines 46-67 to Col.15, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 48, and incorporated herein.

(XX) Claim 50 differs from claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47 and 48 by reciting a method of monitoring an on-site activity by an off-site service person located off-site:

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses providing a communications attachment for an on-site person at an on-site location (See Chapman, Col.4, lines 49-67), establishing communications between an off-site location and the on-site location(See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); communicating information relating to the on-site activity from on-site to the service person located off-site in response to instructions received from the off-site service person (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to

Col.10, line 67); and monitoring the on-site activity off-site (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein the communications attachment includes a transceiver and a display device for displaying instructions received from an off-site service person (See Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a method of monitoring an on-site activity by an off-site service person located off-site to perform their specific function.

The remainder of claim 50 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1, 21, 42, 45, 47, and 48, and incorporated herein.

(YY) As per claim 51, Tubel discloses the method, further comprising the off-site service person directing the on site activity off-site (Col.13, lines 1-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 50, and incorporated herein.

(ZZ) As per claim 52, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the communicating information is produced in response to the off-site service person directing the on-site activity (Col.13, lines 1-67 to Col.14, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 50, and incorporated herein.

(AAA) As per claim 53, Tubel discloses the method wherein the monitoring comprises fishing (The Examiner interprets water 16 to the surface of the ocean floor 18 and then downwardly into formations under the ocean floor as a form of fishing Col.8, lines 64-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 50, and incorporated herein.

(BBB) Claim 54 differs from claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47, 48 and 50 by reciting a system for monitoring an on-site activity by an off-site service person located off-site.

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses communications attachment means for providing a communications attachment attachable to an on-site person (See Chapman, Col.4, lines 49-67); communications establishing means for establishing communications between an on-site location and the off-site location (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); information communicating means for communicating information relating to the on-site activity from on-site to the off-site service person located off-site in response to instructions received from the off-site service person (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); and monitoring means for monitoring the on-site activity off-site (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein the communications attachment includes a transceiver and a display device for displaying

instructions received from an off-site service person (See Yamazaki, Col.3, lines 65-67 to Col.4, line 26).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a method of monitoring an on-site activity by an off-site service person located off-site to perform their specified function.

The remainder of claim 54 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1, 21, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50 and 54, and incorporated herein.

(CCC) Claim 55 differs from claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47, 48 and 50 by reciting a method of doing business comprising:

As per this limitation, it is noted that Chapman discloses providing a communications attachment attachable to an on-site person (See Chapman, Col.4, lines 49-67 to Col.5, line 67), establishing communications between an off-site location and the on-site location; communicating information relating to the on-site activity from on-site to the service person located off-site; and monitoring the on-site activity off-site in response to instructions received from the off-site service person (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67); recording usage data regarding the communications attachment; and monitoring the on-site activity off-site (See Tubel, Col.5, lines 4-67 to Col.6, line 42; Col.9, lines 29-67 to Col.10, line 67) and Yamazaki discloses wherein the communications attachment includes a transceiver and a display device for displaying instructions received from an off-site service person

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a method of doing business to perform their specified function.

The remainder of claim 55 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1, 27, 42, 45, 47, 48, 50 and 54, and incorporated herein.

(DDD) As per claim 56, Tubel discloses the method, wherein the method comprises the off-site service person directing the on-site activity at the off-site location (Col.13, lines 1-67 to Col.14, line 67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Chapman, Tubel and Yamazaki are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 55, and incorporated herein.

#### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-6, 16 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art teaches method and apparatus for determining permeability of subsurface formations (5,463,549), method for determining rock mechanical properties using electrical log data (5,416,697), system and method for facilitating the activities of remote workers (2002/0129139) and Head-



mounted virtual image display device having switching means enabling user to select eye to view image (5,739,797).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

V<sub>A</sub>F  
V.F

April 28, 2005

  
HYUNG SOUGH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600